



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,586	11/24/2003	Donna K. Hodges	BS030348	5016
7590 Scott P. Zimmerman P.O. Box 3822 Cary, NC 27519		08/08/2007	EXAMINER SIKRI, ANISH	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

20

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/720,586	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HODGES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Anish Sikri	<b>Art Unit</b> 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/08/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement submitted on 03/08/2004 been considered by the Examiner and made of record in the application file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Consider **Claims 1-5, 7-16, 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wee et al (US Pat 7,184,548), in view of Craig (US Pat 5,790,176).

Consider **Claim 1**, Wee et al discloses a method retrieving audio-video data (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60) comprising packets of data packetized according to a packet protocol; segmenting the audio-video data into segments (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67) the set of subscriber-specified rules specifying how the audio-video data is formatted to a suit a requirement of a client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30); dispersing at least one of the segments via a network for a subsequent processing service; receiving a result of the processing service (Wee

et al, Col 10, Lines 22-34, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 5-10) ; assembling formatted audio-visual data comprising the result of the processing service (Wee et al, Col 12, Lines 55-65) at least one of the segments that is unprocessed and communicating the formatted audio-visual data via the network (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But Wee et al fails to disclose the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules, which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41), which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 2**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the method according to claim 1, at least one of the segments to suit a display device requirement of the client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But, Wee et al fails to disclose at least one of the segments comprises color correcting.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses at least one of the segments comprises color correcting (Craig, Col 13, Lines 1-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use color correcting methods, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of auto-correction of data when it is being displayed on the display device.

Consider **Claim 3**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising communicating the formatted audio-visual data of the client communication device (Wee et al, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30). The method clearly shows in many ways on how the data is processed and formatted.

Consider **Claim 4**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises scaling the at least one of the segments to suit a display device requirement of the client communications device (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30). It clearly shows on how the formatted data scales itself to the different types of display units.

Consider **Claim 5**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises encrypting at least one of the segments to suit a privacy requirement (Wee et al, Col 9, Lines 18-25). It clearly shows that the data is encrypted to make the content secure, thus enabling the privacy requirements between the subscriber and the service provider.

Consider **Claim 7**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising retrieving the set of subscriber-specified rules from the memory of the client communication device.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses the method comprising retrieving the set of subscriber-specified rules from the memory of the client communication device (Craig, Col 20, Lines 27-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.



Consider **Claim 8**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising inferring an action based upon the set of subscriber-specified rules.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses an action based upon the set of subscriber-specified rules (Craig, Col 20, Lines 27-45).

Therefore it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 9**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising inferring a new rule based upon the set of subscriber-specified rules.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses a new rule based upon the set of subscriber-specified rules (Craig, Col 20, Lines 27-45, Col 20, Lines 46-59).

Therefore it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 10**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising requesting a new rule for a new situation.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses requesting a new rule for a new situation.

Therefore it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on new subscriber specified rules, which can be modified and, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 11**, Wee et al discloses means retrieving audio-video data (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60) comprising packets of data packetized according to a packet protocol; means for segmenting the audio-video data into segments (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67) the set of subscriber-specified rules specifying how the audio-video data is formatted to a suit a requirement of a client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30); means for dispersing at least one of the segments via a network for a subsequent processing service; receiving a result of the processing service (Wee et al, Col 10, Lines 22-34, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 5-10); means of assembling formatted audio-visual data comprising the result of the processing service (Wee et al, Col 12, Lines 55-65) at least one of the segments that is unprocessed and communicating the formatted audio-visual data via the network (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But Wee et al fails to disclose the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules, which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41), which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 12**, Wee et al discloses a computer program retrieving audio-video data (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60) comprising packets of data packetized according to a packet protocol; segmenting the audio-video data into segments (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67) the set of subscriber-specified rules specifying how the audio-video data is formatted to a suit a requirement of a client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30); dispersing at least one of the segments via a network for a subsequent processing service; receiving a result of the processing service (Wee et al, Col 10, Lines 22-34, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 5-10) ; assembling formatted audio-visual data comprising the result of the processing service

Art Unit: 2143

(Wee et al, Col 12, Lines 55-65) at least one of the segments that is unprocessed and communicating the formatted audio-visual data via the network (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 56-60, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But Wee et al fails to disclose the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules, which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses the segments are set to segmented according to a set of subscriber-specified rules (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41), which are stored in the memory, the set of subscriber-specified rules specified by a subscriber to a subscription service (Craig, Col 6, Lines 42-50, Col 11, Lines 36-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of obtaining data based on subscriber specified rules, taught by Craig, in the computer program of Wee et al, for the purpose of obtaining secure media with its digital rights as contracted by the subscription to the service.

Consider **Claim 13**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the method according to claim 11, at least one of the segments to suit a display device requirement of the client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But, Wee et al fails to disclose at least one of the segments comprises color correcting.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses at least one of the segments comprises color correcting (Craig, Col 13, Lines 1-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use color correcting methods, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of auto-correction of data when it is being displayed on the display device.

Consider **Claim 14**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the system according to claim 11, further comprising communicating the formatted audio-visual data of the client communication device (Wee et al, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30). The method clearly shows in many ways on how the data is processed and formatted

Consider **Claim 15**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the system according to claim 11, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises scaling the at least one of the segments to suit a display device requirement of the client communications device (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30). It clearly shows on how the formatted data scales itself to the different types of display units.

Consider **Claim 16**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the system according to claim 11, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises

Art Unit: 2143

encrypting at least one of the segments to suit a privacy requirement (Wee et al, Col 9, Lines 18-25). It clearly shows that the data is encrypted to make the content secure, thus enabling the privacy requirements between the subscriber and the service provider.

Consider **Claim 18**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the computer program according to claim 12, at least one of the segments to suit a display device requirement of the client communications device (Wee et al, Col 11, Lines 19-39, Col 12, Lines 20-30).

But, Wee et al fails to disclose at least one of the segments comprises color correcting.

Nonetheless, Craig discloses at least one of the segments comprises color correcting (Craig, Col 13, Lines 1-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use color correcting methods, taught by Craig, in the system of Wee et al, for the purpose of auto-correction of data when it is being displayed on the display device.

Consider **Claim 19**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the computer program product according to claim 12, further comprising instructions for scaling at least one of the segments to suite a display device requirement of the client

Art Unit: 2143

communication device (Wee et al, Col 7, Lines 64-67, Col 8, Lines 41-45, Col 12, Lines 20-30). It clearly shows on how the formatted data scales itself to the different types of display units.

Consider **Claim 20**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig discloses the computer program according to claim 12, further comprising instructions for encrypting at least one of the segments to suit a privacy requirement (Wee et al, Col 9, Lines 18-25). It clearly shows that the data is encrypted to make the content secure, thus enabling the privacy requirements between the subscriber and the service provider.

Consider **Claims 6, 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wee et al (US Pat 7,184,548), in view of Craig (US Pat 5,790,176), and in further view of Balachandran et al (US Pat 6,567,375).

Consider **Claim 6**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the method according to claim 1, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises specifying that at least one of the segments be processed during off-peak hours (Balachandran et al , Col 6, Lines 35-57) .

Nonetheless, Balachandran et al discloses dispersing at least one of the segments comprises specifying that at least one of the segments be processed during off-peak hours.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of data processing during peak hours, taught by Balanchandran et al, in the system of Wee et al, as modified by Craig for the purpose of efficient data management and reducing server loads during heavy peak hours.

Consider **Claim 17**, Wee et al, as modified by Craig fails to disclose the system according to claim 11, wherein dispersing at least one of the segments comprises specifying that at least one of the segments be processed during off-peak hours (Balachandran et al , Col 6, Lines 35-57) .



Art Unit: 2143

Nonetheless, Balachandran et al discloses dispersing at least one of the segments comprises specifying that at least one of the segments be processed during off-peak hours.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of data processing during peak hours, taught by Balanchandran et al, in the system of Wee et al, as modified by Craig, for the purpose of efficient data management and reducing server loads during heavy peak hours.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Sikri whose telephone number is 571-270-1783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anish Sikri

a.s.

August 6, 2007

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100